

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated February 2, 2007, in which claims 1-20 were rejected, and in response to the interview conducted with the Examiner on May 1, 2007. With this Amendment, claims 1 and 18 have been amended, claims 2 and 3 have been canceled, and claims 21 and 22 have been added as new claims. The remaining claims are unchanged in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims 1 and 4-22.

In section 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, 12-13, 15-16 and 18-20 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,320,559 in view of Schoolman, U.S. Patent No. 5,281,957. In section 4 of the Office Action, claim 7 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa in view of Schoolman and further in view of Preston, U.S. Patent No. 6,094,283. In section 5 of the Office Action, Claim 14 was rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa et al. and Schoolman and further in view of Hori et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,072,209, hereinafter Hori. In section 6 of the Office Action, claim 17 was also under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa in view of Schoolman and further in view of Kato et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,497,170. In section 7 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 11 were rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasukawa in view of Schoolman and further in view of Mann, U.S. Patent No. 6,307,526.

With this Amendment, claims 1 and 18 are amended to clarify that the projection unit is adapted to display data received from an information source only as front projected data in front of the projection unit and the data that the projection unit is adapted to display includes data from a computer and video from a television set. Support for these amendments is present at the bottom of page 3 of the Specification. Said support indicates that data from a computer or video from a television is displayed in front of the user in a clear space or a wall.

As discussed in the interview with the Examiner on May 1, 2007, in Yasukawa and Schoolman, any device worn by the user always includes a physical display component for the user to see an image, which is within the physical display component. Nowhere do the cited references (Yasukawa, Schoolman, Preston, Hori, Kato and Mann) taken individually or in

combination teach or suggest a projection unit that is adapted to display data received from an information source only as front projected data in front of, and outside of, the projection unit and the data that the projection unit is adapted to display includes data from a computer and video from a television set. (Emphasis Added.) Therefore, claims 1 and 18 are non-obvious and allowable over the cited art.

Applicant respectfully submits that the dependent claims are also allowable at least by virtue of their dependency, either directly or indirectly, from the allowable independent claims. Further, the dependent claims set forth numerous elements not shown or suggested in the cited references. For example, claim 4 includes “a motion sensor and a controller, the controller is adapted to receive an input from the motion sensor and to responsively disable or enable a receiver of the projection unit.” (Emphasis Added.) The Office Action suggests that components 107 and 132 of Yasukawa show this element of claim 4. However, component 107 of Yasukawa is an angle sensor that works in conjunction with CPU 132 to adjust images displayed in response to the operator’s head being moved. No enabling or disabling of a receiver of a projection unit in a manner required by claim 4 is shown or suggested in Yasukawa or the other cited references.

Claims 21 and 22 are new claims in the application. These claims depend from allowable claim 4 and therefore are also believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 4. Further, claim 21 includes “the controller is adapted to provide a shutdown control signal to the receiver when motion detected by the motion sensor is found to be above a predetermined threshold,” and claim 22 includes “the controller is adapted to provide a startup control signal to the receiver when motion detected by the motion sensor is found to be below a predetermined threshold.” Support for the elements of new claims 21 and 22 can be found at the top of page 5 of the Specification. None of the cited references teach or suggest the elements of claim 21 and claim 22 and therefore these claims are allowable.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims 1 and 4-22. Favorable action upon all claims is solicited.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: AG Rego

Alan G. Rego, Reg. No. 45,956
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

AGR/tkj